

Remarks

The Office Action mailed June 30, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment and following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, 18-27, 29-31, 33-42, and 44-53 are now pending in this application. Claims 3, 17, 28, 32, and 43 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 13-15, 26-28, and 40-42 stand rejected. Claims 3-12, 16-25, 29-39, and 43-53 are objected to.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Darkins et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,821,085) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 3 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations from Claim 3. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Darkins et al.

Claim 2 depends from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claim 2 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that depend Claim 2 likewise is patentable over Darkins et al.

With respect to Claim 42, Claim 43 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 43 has been canceled and independent Claim 42 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations from Claim 43. Accordingly, Claim 42 is submitted to be patentable over Darkins et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 42 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 13-15, 27-28 and 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Darkins, Jr. et al. in view of Miller et al. (US 6,045,310) is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claims 13-15, Claim 17 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 17 has been canceled and independent Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations from Claim 17. Accordingly, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Darkins et al. in view of Miller et al.

Claims 14 and 15 depends from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14 and 15 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicants submit that depend Claims 14 and 15 likewise are patentable over Darkins et al. in view of Miller et al.

With respect to Claims 27 and 28, Claim 32 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claims 32 and 28 have been canceled and independent Claim 27 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations from Claims 32 and 28. Accordingly, Claim 27 is submitted to be patentable over Darkins et al. in view of Miller et al.

Claim 40 depends from independent Claim 27. When the recitations of Claim 2 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that depend Claim 2 likewise is patentable over Darkins et al.

With respect to Claim 41, Claim 43 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 43 has been canceled and independent Claim 41 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations from Claim 43. Accordingly, Claim 41 is submitted to be patentable over Darkins et al. in view of Miller et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 13-15, 27-28 and 40-41 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-12, 16-25, 29-39, and 43-53 were indicated as objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 3. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 4-12 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 4-12 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that depend Claims 4-12 likewise are in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 16-25, Claim 17 has been canceled and independent Claim 13 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 17. Accordingly, Claim 13 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 16 and 18-25 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 16 and 18-25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicants submit that depend Claims 16 and 18-25 likewise are in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 29-39, Claim 32 has been canceled and independent Claim 27 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claims 28 and 32. Accordingly, Claim 27 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 29-31 and 33-39 depend from independent Claim 27. When the recitations of Claims 29-31 and 33-39 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 27, Applicants submit that depend Claims 29-31 and 33-39 likewise are in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 43-53, Claim 43 has been canceled and independent Claim 42 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 43. Accordingly, Claim 42 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 44-53 depend from independent Claim 43. When the recitations of Claims 44-53 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 43, Applicants submit that depend Claims 44-53 likewise are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert B. Reeser III', is written over a horizontal line.

Robert B. Reeser III
Registration No. 45,548
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070